

the catalyzing reaction that takes place by the introduction of sulfuric acid to the slurry. This is another feature of applicant's invention wherein the remaining sodium sulfate acts as a catalyst in the formation of the carbonaceous crystals that characterize the internal crystalline structure of the cementitious matrixes. See applicant's specification at page 5, lines 26-27 and at page 6, lines 1-5.

In contrast to applicant's claimed invention, both Jaques et al. and Iwu wash their materials with water. See Iwu, column 1, lines 52-57 and Jaques et al., column 5, lines 19-23. In Iwu and Jaques et al. and Iwu teach washing of the slurry four times.

Further, Iwu, in column 1, line 25, teaches away from use of sulfuric acid because Iwu gets rid of chloride from hydrochloric acid and does not get catalyzing sodium sulfate, as provided in applicant's claims.

With respect to Jaques et al., that patent "digests" silica ore without mentioning pH, neither mentioning of any sodium hydroxide, or sodium sulfate formation.

In addition, neither Jaques et al. nor Iwu teaches the step of pulverizing bauxite tailings or bauxite into a generally homogenous powder sufficiently fine to generally pass through a 16 mesh screen, as provided in applicant's claims. Jaques et al. also does not teach the addition of the bauxite tailings as water is added to the tailings. See also applicant's specification at page 2, lines 26-27; page 3, lines 1-27 and page 4, lines 1-9.

Infringement is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v Union Carbide Corp., 814 F.2d. 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d. 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and MPEP §2131. A prior art reference must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

